REMARKS

Applicant replies to the Final Office Action dated June 1, 2006, within two months. Thus Applicant requests an Advisory Action, if necessary. Claims 1-8, 11, 19-20, 22-23, 27-28, and 36 were pending in the application and the Examiner rejects claims 1-8, 11, 19-20, 22-23, 27-28, and 36. Support for the amendments may be found in the originally-filed specification, claims, and figures. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Applicant asserts that the application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the pending claims is requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1-8, 11, 19-20, 22-23, 27-28 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Markus et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,490,601 ("Markus") in view of Mohan et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0140312 A1 ("Mohan"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Markus discloses a server for automatically filling in form fields of an electronic document by a user creating a profile. The profile contains information that would be commonly used to fill out an online form such as, for example, first and last name, address, telephone number, email address, credit card number, etc. When the user subsequently accesses an online form that has been previously mapped by a privacy bank, a profile bundle is created and transmitted to the user's browser application, wherein data elements from the bundle are inserted into the various form fields as indicated by the map.

The Examiner correctly notes that Marcus does not disclose, "obtaining user entered data from the electronic form, wherein the user entered data is at least one of absent from the user profile and different from the user data in a corresponding field" and "updating the user profile with the user entered data" (page 5, paragraph 2). However, the Examiner asserts that these steps are disclosed by Mohan. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Mohan generally discloses a form fill utility that enables end users to quickly complete online forms with little or no keystrokes. Specifically, Mohan discloses a user profile that is maintained by the user through an interface to the form fill host. Mohan further discloses a transaction database that stores forms that have been previously filled out by the user. Data residing in the transaction database is generally used to fill in subsequent matching forms; however, Mohan discloses that, in one embodiment, the user can select whether to fill out a form using data from the user profile, the transaction database or both.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's understanding of Mohan as set forth in the "Response to Arguments" section of the Office Action. Applicant maintains the assertion that Mohan does not disclose, either directly or inherently, a user profile which is updated with data that is added or modified within a form field. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicant amends independent claims 1 and 36 to even more clearly differentiate the present invention from the cited references.

Mohan discloses a process whereby data in the transaction database is updated using data from the user profile. Referring to block 1045 of the relevant figure, Mohan discloses that, "the changed information is filled in from the user profile" (paragraph 93). Thus, Mohan discloses that if data was changed in the user profile that pre-dates any changes to the transaction database, then the changed information from the user profile is used to update the transaction database. Mohan does not disclose, nor infer, a test to determine whether changes to the transactional database pre-date changes to the user profile. Even more significant is that Mohan is silent as to updating the user profile based on changed data from the transaction database.

"'Inherency may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient. [citations omitted.] If, however, the disclosure is sufficient to show that the natural result from the operation as taught would result in the performance of the questioned function, it seems to be well settled that the disclosure should be regarded as sufficient.'" (quoting *In re Oelrich,* 666 F.2d 578, 581 (CCPA 1981)). A test to determine whether changes to the transactional database pre-date changes to the user profile, or updating the user profile based on changed data from the transaction database, is in no way a natural result of the Mohan operations.

In paragraph 95, Mohan discloses actions that may be taken by a user after a form has been filled with data from the transaction database as described in reference to block 1050. After a form has been filled, the user can edit, add, or delete data from the form. If form data is modified by the user, then the process proceeds to block 1055 which is explained in paragraph 96.

Mohan, in paragraph 96, discloses how form data is processed when it is submitted to the destination server. According to Mohan at paragraph 96, "the IIM stores the information submitted to the server in the user's transaction database." In other words, when a form is submitted, data from the form is stored within the user's transaction database, whether or not the form contains modified data. Significantly, Mohan does not perform a test on the form data to determine whether it was modified prior to committing the change to the corresponding data field within the database.

As such, Mohan does not disclose or suggest at least, "comparing the field data to the corresponding user data in the user profile," and "replacing the user data in the user profile with the field data, when the field data is different from the user data in the user profile," as similarly recited by independent claims 1 and 36.

Dependent claims 2-8, 11, 19-20, 22-23 and 27-28 include all the limitations of independent claim 1, so dependent claims 2-8, 11, 19-20, 22-23 and 27-28 are patentable for at least the same reasons set forth above, as well as in view of their own respective features.

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is thus requested. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. **19-2814**. Applicant invites the Examiner to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner has any questions regarding this Reply or the present application in general.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 1, 2006   By: _____

Howard Sobelman
Reg. No. 39,038

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6228
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: hsobelman@swlaw.com